

REMARKS

Applicants' attorney conducted an interview with the Examiner on January 21, 2004. Applicants' attorney wish to thank the Examiner for his time and favorable consideration.

Applicants have amended claims 15 and 30 to define the present invention with more specificities. Support can be found at page 20, lines 23-24 of the original specification. Applicants have also amended claims 16-17, 19, 22-23 to define the sensors in structural terms.

No new matter has been added by these amendments. Entry is believed to be proper and respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the amendments, Claims 15-17, 19, 22-30, 33-38 are pending. No additional claims fee is believed due.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102 And 103

The Examiner maintains the 102 and 103 rejections of the claims as being anticipated by Naya et al. (JP 01-277,600), and in the alternative, being obvious in view of Naya et al.. The Examiner states that Naya et al. discloses a dry cleaning drying control system that controls the drying cycle by determining the terminal point in drying operation; the system uses a semiconductor gas sensor for dry cleaning solvent vapor which is controlled by a temperature condition detector. In response Applicants' argument in the paper submitted on September 15, 2003, Examiner suggests that the thermistor in Naya et al. is not part of the gas sensor and can be considered as the condition sensor.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's position.

However, in order to advance the prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims to define the claimed system with more specificity, namely, the signal processor is configured to compare a first signal from the gas sensor to a first threshold value and a second signal from the condition sensor to a second threshold value. Applicants submit that Naya et al. does not teach or suggest the presently claimed system.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Claim Objections

The Examiner rejects Claims 16, 17, 19, 22 and 23 for failing to provide further structural limitations to the claimed apparatus.

Applicants have amended Claims 16, 17, 19, 22 and 23 to include structural terms.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these objections.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the above represents an earnest effort to place the present application in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and objections, and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

In the event that issues remain prior to allowance of the pending claims, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned attorney to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,  
For: France et al.



Caroline Wei-Berk  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 45,203  
(513) 627-0352

January 21, 2004  
Customer No. 27752